



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

I see no need, and indeed it seems to me a great disadvantage, to divide the publication into separate series. Each experiment station and each other large research institution; many libraries and many individuals, will desire the whole publication. Citation should be to the journal as a whole and not to separate series. If division into series be attempted their boundaries will be artificial and their number will be constantly changing and no stability will be secured.

Issuance in series will also inevitably lead to delay. The only advantage of such a series will be that each investigator may receive only the series concerning his particular field. This end may be attained with even greater accuracy by issuing each article as a special number of the journal, and sending to subscribers only such numbers as contain articles pertinent to the subscriber's interest. In this I incline to the view expressed by Bailey<sup>2</sup> and avoid the difficulties raised by Gilmore<sup>3</sup> and by Webber himself.

If there be no separate series of the journal the editorial board would need to be enlarged to include one or more men in each special field of research. These editors should be paid sufficient compensation to make it their duty to give *immediate attention* to each article submitted to them, and thus to facilitate publication.

Numbers upon designated subjects should be sold to station workers at a price sufficient to control actual waste, but low enough to be without burden to the subscriber, as, say, 25 per cent. of actual cost.

F. L. STEVENS

*Vegetable Pathologist*

N. C. EXPERIMENT STATION

#### HOLOTHURIAN NAMES

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: In reference to the letters by Dr. Theo. Gill and Dr. W. K. Fisher in SCIENCE for August 7 and September 20, respectively, I would ask whether Dr. Fisher's conclusion that "we can no longer speak of sea-cucumbers as 'holothurians,' nor of the class as *Holothurioidea*" is really justified.

<sup>2</sup> SCIENCE, Vol. XXVI., p. 512.

<sup>3</sup> SCIENCE, Vol. XXVI., p. 511.

Even if the name *Holothuria* be taken up by the writers on Cœlentera, is there any reason why we should not continue the use of what has now become an ordinary English word? And as regards the name of the class, I would protest against the assumption that this must necessarily be based on the name of one of the families or one of the genera included in the class.

It is generally held that the word *ὀλοθοῦριον*, used by Aristotle ("Historia Animalium," I., i., 19, and "Partes Animalium," IV., v., 43), as well as the word *Holothurium*, used by Pliny ("Naturalis Historiæ," Liber I., Cap. xlvii.), refer to a sea-cucumber. This is surely enough to justify the continued use of the class name Holothurioidea.

Since in these days the genus *Holothuria* has become so much split up that it would in any case be difficult to decide for which of its sections the name *Holothuria* should be retained, the disappearance of the name from systematic usage is by no means to be regretted. As for the possible transference of the name *Holothuria* to either a pelagic hydroid or a tunicate, this appears to be eminently one of those cases which should be disposed of by an international committee, such as it was proposed should be established by the International Zoological Congress. I am not aware whether such a committee was actually appointed.

Both your correspondents seem to have overlooked the fact that the absurdities following a rigid adherence to rule in this matter were well put by my colleague Mr. F. Jeffrey Bell in his note "A Test Case for the Law of Priority" (*Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, pp. 108-109; July, 1891).

F. A. BATHER

LONDON

#### SPECIAL ARTICLES

##### A SUGGESTION FOR A NEW UNIT OF ENERGY<sup>1</sup>

THE study of the food of man and of animals as a source of energy to the organism has made rapid progress within recent years. It is, of course, easy to overestimate the value

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Society for the Promotion of Agricultural Science at its annual meeting, May 27, 1907.